

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
HEARING MINUTES

JUNE 24, 2010

Commissioners

Tim Daniel, Chairman

Scott Winnette, Vice Chairman (not present)

Timothy Wesolek

Robert Jones

Joshua Russin (not present)

Gary Baker

Shawn Burns (not present)

Brian Dylus, Alternate

-

Aldermanic Representative

Michael O'Connor

Staff

Emily Paulus, Historic Preservation Planner

Lisa Mroszczyk, Historic Preservation Planner

Scott Waxter, Assistant City Attorney

Shannon Albaugh, HPC Administrative Assistant

•I. Call to Order

Mr. Daniel called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. He stated that the technical qualifications of the Commission and the staff are on file with the City of Frederick and are made a part of each and every case before the Commission. He also noted that the Frederick City Historic Preservation Commission uses the Guidelines adopted by the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation published by the U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and these Guidelines are made a part of each and every case.

All cases were duly advertised in the Frederick News Post in accordance with Section 301 of the Land Management Code.

Announcements

Mr. Daniel announced that he did not attend the last hearing / workshop but he did view the streaming video and listened to the recordings as well as visited the sites.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. June 10, 2010 Hearing / Workshop Minutes

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to approve the June 10, 2010 hearing and June 10, 2010 workshop minutes as written.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

• **II. HPC Business**

IV. Consent Items

-

There were no consent items.

-

•**V. Cases to be Heard**

2. HPC10-151 245 E. Church Street

Loren Deren

Enclose deck on second floor
agent

Rollie Belles,

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the enclosure of the second floor of a two-story rear porch located on the rear of a contributing rowhouse. It would be covered with wood lap siding with a 6 inch exposure. The door opening on the second floor rear would be maintained, as would the window. The roof would remain. While the initial concept did not include any window openings along the exterior wall, the applicant has added a 2/2 all wood window to align with the window beneath at the first floor in response to comments received at the workshop. The applicant is also proposing to re-install the shutters from the existing window at the new window opening.

Discussion

Mr. Daniel asked if the applicant was planning on retaining the existing window that is in the opening. Mr. Rollie Belles (the agent) answered they were leaving the window in.

Ms. Paulus added that for clarification on the window cut sheet if it's a 2/2 staff would not recommend approval of muntins between the glass. They should be either a true divided light or simulated divided light.

Mr. Daniel asked if the intent with the divisions is to match the window that is below. Mr. Belles answered yes and that he thought that was what is there now.

Mr. Baker asked if the applicant was in agreement with staff to not put the shutters back up. Ms. Deren (the applicant) answered that it did not matter to her and whatever the Commission decided would be fine.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the proposed enclosure of the second floor of the two-story rear porch, with the following materials and specifications:

- Elevation drawing, dated 5/5/10 (without re-installation of shutters)
- Painted wood lap siding with a 6" reveal
- 2/2 all wood Jeld-Wen window
- Painted wood posts
- Retention of beadboard ceiling and fascia at first floor

Motion: **Tim Daniel moved to approve the enclosure of the second floor of the two-story rear porch, with the following materials and specifications:**

- **Elevation drawing dated 5/5/10 (without the re-installation of shutters)**
- **Painted wood lap siding with a 6" reveal**
- **2/2 all wood Jeld-Wen window with a simulated or true divided light with final choice being left to the applicant upon submission to staff for final conformation**
- **Painted wood posts**
- **Retention of beadboard ceiling and fascia at first floor**
- **Retention of the existing window at the rear wall**

They believe that this is consistent with the Guidelines and that the existing rear wall, roof and openings will be preserved. The addition will be confined to the existing porch foot print and the overall design and materials used is consistent with the character of the Historic District.

Second: **Gary Baker**

Vote: **5 - 0**

3. HPC10-157

20 E. South Street

Evelyn Cook

Rebuild porch roof and replace siding

Emily Paulus

Ms. Paulus announced that this application qualifies for administrative approval because in her last communication with the applicant it was believed that they were now able to pursue removal of the vinyl siding and repair and restoration of the brick wall.

4. HPC10-164

106 W. 4th Street

Judith Candela

Construct a two-story rear addition

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval to construct a 22' by 10' addition on the rear of a contributing mid-19th century duplex. The addition would feature materials salvaged from a ca. 1900 farmhouse elsewhere in Maryland, including German lap siding and 2/2 double-hung wood windows. The roofing would be standing seam metal. The application also involves removal of the existing vinyl siding on the east elevation of the frame rear addition and its replacement with new lap siding. The applicant has proposed numerous changes following the workshop. They include:

On the south (rear) elevation:

- The addition of 2/2 windows at the first and second floor and realignment of the openings
- Installation of a single 3-panel Jeld-Wen wood door at the first floor (to match the second floor door) in place of the previously proposed French doors
- The addition of a standard wood railing at the stoop

On the east (side) elevation:

- Removal of two windows and reconfiguration of remaining windows

On the west (side) elevation:

- Removal of the windows

The roofline has been lowered approximately 6-8 inches. In addition, approximately one-third of the existing rear wall would be preserved.

Discussion

Judith Candela, the applicant, had nothing more to add.

Mr. Daniel asked if the 2/2 windows were going to be true divided light. Ms. Candela answered that they were true divided light.

Mr. Baker asked if there was a reason they were not going out a little bit farther with the railing. Ms. Candela answered that it was to keep everything in line.

Mr. Daniel asked if the intent was to align the existing fascia with the new. Ms. Candela answered yes.

Mr. Baker stated that he thought it was amazing how these small modifications made a big improvement over what was presented at workshop.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the construction of a 22' by 10' addition on the rear of a contributing mid-19th century duplex, including the removal of vinyl siding from the east elevation of the existing frame addition and its replacement with wood lap siding.

Materials to be approved include:

- Scope of work, drawings A4, A1, A2, A3, and S1 - revised 6/14/10

Motion: Robert Jones moved to approve the construction of a 22' by 10' addition on the rear of a contributing mid-19th century duplex, including the removal of vinyl siding from the east elevation of the existing frame addition and its replacement with wood lap siding. The materials to be approved includes what is described in the scope of work and drawings A4 dated 6/22/10 and drawings A1, A2, A3, and S1 - revised 6/14/10

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 0

5. HPC10-165

112 W. Church Street

John Laughlin

Demolish two sheds

Emily Paulus

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to continue the case until the next scheduled hearing.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

6. HPC10-166 112 W. Church Street John Laughlin

Install brick patio in rear yard

Emily Paulus

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to continue the case until the next scheduled hearing.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

**7. HPC10-173 611-613 N. Market Street Housing
Authority of the**

Paint mural on side of building **City of
Frederick**

Lisa Mroszczyk

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to continue the case until the next scheduled hearing.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

8. HPC10-193

7-9 W. Patrick Street

Philip Catron

Remove window in-fills & install new windows

Lisa Mroszczyk

Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the removal of brick infill on the first and second floors of rear wing dating from the early 20th century and the installation of 6/6 double hung wood windows with simulated divided lights.

Discussion

Steve Knott, representing the applicant, had nothing more to add.

Mr. Baker asked if the applicant was recommending the windows be the same size. Mr. Knott answered yes that they would be up to the original lintel but they would be up from the original bottom.

Mr. Baker asked if they were going to use a row lock for soldier course on the sill. Mr. Knott answered that it was his design since some of the buildings in downtown have the row of brick. Mr. Baker asked if the front of the building had brick because

in the pictures it appeared to be wood. Mr. Knott was not sure because he did not have a picture of the front of the building. Mr. Baker stated that brick lasts longer if they are sloped correctly but the applicant would have the option of going with wood if they wanted to match the existing structure.

Mr. Daniel stated that cut sheet had a clad unit and a wood unit and asked if the intent was to use the wood unit. Mr. Knott answered yes.

Mr. Daniel asked that since they are using a wood lintel would they be amenable to using a wood sill. Mr. Knott answered yes. Mr. Baker stated that if they are going to go with wood to match the windows in the back to the ones in the front to hopefully get the correct slope on the windows.

Public Comment

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends approval of the application with the condition the shadow (spacer) bar be a dark color.

Materials to be approved:

- Jeld-Wen Double-Hung Premium Wood (non-clad) Siteline windows
- Proposal from CCS, Inc. dated 5/18/2010
- Drawing show location of and section through window

-

Motion: Brian Dylus moved to the application as staff recommended with the condition that the shadow (spacer) bar be a dark color, the JeldWen Double-Hung Premium Wood (non-clad) Siteline windows in accordance with the proposal from CCS, Inc. dated 5/18/2010, the drawing show location of and

section through window and that both the lintel and sill conditions are to match those of the front of the building in profile and material.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 0

9. HPC10-202

26 S. Market Street

Helen Walker

Paint Mural on side of building
Norman, agent

Kara

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking Level 2 review of a painted sign to be located on the side of a contributing building in the historic district. The sign is part of the Wayfinding program, which was approved by the Commission in September 2008. During the Level I review, a painted wall sign was shown in some of the early design development concepts for the parking sign types and received favorable preliminary feedback; no specific design or concept was ever approved.

The sign would be painted on the exposed south elevation of the contributing building, and includes reuse of an existing post-1961 painted sign that reads "Park Here For". A text bar that includes nearby destinations would follow the arrow. A musical bar would run underneath the text to denote the Arts and Entertainment District. The "Downtown Frederick" logo would also be painted on the side of the building. Faux arched tops would be painted above the three modern windows along the side of the building - mimicking the arched window openings seen on the front façade.

Discussion

Kara Norman, with Downtown Frederick Partnership, stated that she is acting as an agent representing the property owner, but she wanted to make it clear for part of the time she would be speaking on behalf of Downtown Frederick Partnership (DFP). She added that they are mutual in this case because DFP took the project to the property owner and asked them to sign onto it. There are things that the property owner indicated to the Partnership that are part of their support for the application and the Partnership has been working on the Wayfinding project for more than seven years at this point. She stated that this is one of the last two pieces of the overall project to be approved and the reason they have been held back from the rest of the project is because the concepts were presented earlier but no specific or final design was presented for a couple of reasons. One was these particular designs were created by the mural artist who are actually going to implement the mural itself and they felt it was important that the person doing the painting was involved in the design. Ms. Norman went on to say that the second aspect was that they had been working with Planning staff and they changed some regulations so that this type of signage would be included in the Wayfinding program and therefore from the City's Planning Department's perspective it was considered Wayfinding signage as opposed to signage for a private business. She spoke to the three things staff recommended in their conditions for approval. The Partnership and more particularly the building owner felt strongly that the musical bar should be included because it further exemplifies the arts and entertainment district and the building owner wanted an artistic element to it. She went on to say that their original visioning of it was more along the lines of what you see in the "Angels in Architecture" series where they created some building elements and that is why you see the arched top windows and things like that. She added that they have no problem with bringing the starting point of the musical bar back a little bit from the façade although one down side is there is a metal pipe that would be nicely disguised by the music bar. She went on to the second condition related to muting the color of the "Downtown Frederick" text and stated that it is their intent and they have no concerns with working with staff to ensure that the final color selection is muted. She also stated that the final recommendation is reducing the size of the "Downtown Frederick" text, which is there to pull it and tie it into the rest of the overall system for the Wayfinding signage. She said that the text is used throughout the system and it creates the linkage between the signs that are in streets and this mural so they really want to clearly identify to visitors that they are a part of the same system. She was fine with reducing the size but cutting it in half was more than what she was going for and she was hoping to keep around 2/3rds of the size.

Mr. Baker thought the graphics were a little busy and he liked the size of "Downtown Frederick". He said that the bigger problem he had was the arches above the square windows as contemporary as they are, and he suggested a flat jack arch or a flat lintel. Mr. Daniel stated that he agreed with Mr. Baker about the faux arches on two accounts. One, there is a hierarchy to the building and trying to match what's in the front isn't necessarily appropriate since the side is secondary. Two, creating a faux anything in what's supposed to be a true historic district is a little bit disconcerting even though it is somewhat light hearted. It does give a false reading of the building, which is questionable, so he would be supportive of not having the faux arches. He went on to say that in general since it is signage and it is a painted thing on the side of the building he did not feel strongly about criticizing the proportions, colors and design. He thought it was nicely done and he agreed that "Downtown Frederick" is an okay size as it is and the fact that it is already relatively muted it is not too objectionable. Mr. Dylus also agreed that the size of the "Downtown Frederick" text was fine as well as the color. Mr. Dylus added that he liked the musical bar extending to the edge of the building as opposed to moving it back to the start of the text.

Ms. Norman stated that if the faux arches need to be removed that is fine.

Public Comment - There was no public comment

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the painted sign, with the following conditions:

- That the "Downtown Frederick" text be reduced in size so that it either a) extends no higher than the top of the building's first floor, or b) is reduced to approximately half its current size; and
- That the "Downtown Frederick" text be significantly muted in color (with final color selection to be approved by staff prior to installation); and
- That the musical bar not extend beyond the text bar above it.

Motion: Brian Dylus moved to approve the application as amended and that the "Downtown Frederick" text remain as shown in the rendering (the rendering is not dated), that the "Downtown Frederick" text be significantly muted in color with final selection to be approved by the staff prior to installation, and that the musical bar be painted as shown on the rendering instead of the staff recommendation that the bar not extend beyond the text bar above it, and that the three faux arches be removed from the rendering.

Second: Timothy Wesolek

Vote: 5 - 0

10. HPC10-203

38 E. Patrick Street

Jon Harden

Paint mural on side of building
Norman, agent

Kara

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking Level 2 review of a painted sign to be located on the side of a contributing building in the historic district. The sign is part of the Wayfinding program, which was approved by the Commission in September 2008. During the Level I review, a painted wall sign was shown in some of the early design development concepts for the parking sign types and received favorable preliminary feedback; no specific design or concept was ever approved.

The sign would be painted on the exposed east elevation of the contributing building, and includes a "Park Here For" arrow that mirrors the existing painted sign at 26 South Market Street. A text bar that includes nearby destinations would follow the arrow. The "Downtown Frederick" logo would also be painted on the side of the building. Faux windows and a cornice would be painted at the building's upper story.

Discussion

Kara Norman, with Downtown Frederick Partnership, stated that as it relates to the proposed staff condition relating to the text bar, she appreciated the desire to limit the text bar but the reason it is the width that it is because unfortunately National Museum of Civil War Medicine is a very long name and is not easily divided up into anything smaller. She said that they have a goal of a particular font size so it is legible to motorists so they have arrived at that length of the text bar as a function of the length of the name of the museum. Ms. Paulus asked if the name was abbreviated elsewhere in the system. Ms. Norman answered that they do abbreviate it on some signs but they were hoping to not abbreviate it here. She went on to say that in the case of the faux windows and cornice the property owner feels that they are very important to include the items on the side of the building. They felt that is what creates the public art component to this project and they see that as creating a reference to some of the other public art that has been done in Downtown Frederick. She realized that the cornice replicates what is shown on the front façade so she spoke with the property owner and they are willing to simplify the design of the cornice and they are also willing to entertain the windows being smaller.

Mr. Wesolek asked why there was no music bar on this one. Ms. Norman answered that she wasn't sure if the Commission would go for it, so she thought it was best to keep it simple and this is a smaller façade but it could certainly be added to this one.

Mr. Daniel asked if the building owner would be amenable to more abstract windows painted on the building instead of the faux realistic look. Ms. Norman answered she wasn't sure but they were very excited about this particular design and really wanted to retain it. She added that from their perspective they viewed creating these faux elements as being public art but she did not ask him about abstracting them. She added that this rendering shows "photoshopped" windows and when you do it for real they are not going to be that good. Mr. Daniel stated that his worry was that artists actually do a pretty realistic job of it and it normally is not the Commission job to critique the content of artwork but when the artwork is creating a false impression of the building that is a little troublesome in terms of the Guidelines.

Alderman O'Connor had a question about process because the applicant had used the term public art and they went through the whole process of drafting Guidelines for a process where public art would come forward. If by the applicant's acknowledgement this is public art, he wondered if the Historic Preservation Commission was the first step for that component of this signage or whether that shouldn't rightfully be a consideration for the Public Art Task Force before it comes to the Commission. He went on to say that the Commission could look specifically at the signage element which is what they were asking approval for and allow the mural to be its own project with its own process. Ms. Norman thought the issue was that there is not a very good definition of public art which is what they were seeing here and one of the issues is that if you look at what staff has commented on in the staff report they are clearly referring to it as signage and obviously it is part of the Wayfinding signage system. She went on to say that from a building owner perspective they are looking at it differently. Mr. Waxter didn't think there was a correct answer on this. Certainly it had been talked about as a mural and maybe that is the owner's opinion and maybe it is of interest to have Commissioners look at this and if they consider it to be some type of artwork then perhaps as the Alderman said this is something that should go to the Public Art Task Force first because they will listen to what the recommendations are and weigh any decision that they make with them in mind. He did agree with the Alderman's comments that they are getting beyond just a sign that says "Park Here" when art elements have been added. Nick Colonna, Division Manager of Comprehensive Planning, stated that what was before them is a signage application and the windows and cornice are elements of that sign and the question that the Alderman brings forward is a good one. He went on to say that right now it is submitted as elements of the sign and it does either way effect the context of the building and the impact which the Commission has purview over so they could approve the signage itself or they could make the recommendation that they feel it is public art and bring it back to Public Arts Task Force and ultimately HPC will review it again in terms of context and not content.

Mr. Baker stated that the windows and cornice do take away from the design in a lot of ways and is trying to imitate something that it is not and whereas he is all for art and all for seeing something there this is either not far enough or something is wrong with it.

Mr. Daniel stated that it seemed from the comments that were made they would be premature on making a decision on what was in front of them so he suggested continuing the application.

Public Comment - There was no public comment

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the painted sign, with the following conditions:

- That the text bar be reduced in width; and
- That the "Downtown Frederick" text be significantly muted in color (with final color selection to be approved by staff prior to installation); and
- That the faux windows and cornice be eliminated.

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to continue this application for two weeks to allow the applicant to draw up additional designs and to revisit this on the July 8, 2010 hearing.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh

Administrative Assistant